



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ART. XVIII.—*An appeal from the judgments of Great Britain respecting the United States of America. Part first, containing an historical outline of their merits and wrongs as colonies ; and strictures upon the calumnies of the British writers. By Robert Walsh, jr. Second edition. Philadelphia, Mitchell, Ames, & White, 1819, 8vo, pp. 512.*

THERE is a great deal of justice in the following expression from the famous Essay on the Canon and Feudal Law, by President Adams ; ‘Is there not something extremely fallacious in the common-place images of mother country and children colonies?’ (p. 136, London edition, 1768) We should be inclined to extend the idea farther. One hears a good deal of national friendships and national enmities ; of parental and of filial regards between states : but we are apt to think that this sort of language has at best but a rhetorical correctness. One sees, even in private life, and between individual men, that the members of the same family, born of one blood and nursed at one bosom, need but to wander away in different paths of pursuit, or get entangled in opposite parties, or wedded to rival interests, and all the tenderness of relationship is forgotten, and they go beyond even strangers in the cruelty of their jealousies and enmities. As between nations there are no such strong ties to be broken, no such tender sensibilities to be wounded, it is not natural that the general and abstract prepossessions, which may exist between them, should survive the first shocks of conflicting commercial or political interests. Are nations remote and disconnected from us, then we are indifferent to them. There is certainly no people on the earth whom we have less cause to dislike, than the inhabitants of the Birman empire. But we do not know them, we are not acquainted with them, we do not meet them on the highways of the sea or earth, which we frequent. We have no doubt they are excellent people, and have an excellent government ; as good a people and as good a government as those of Russia, Hayti, or Turkey ; but not having had occasion to interchange those little national presents of cargoes of silk, nankin, and tea ; of cotton, tobacco, and flour, we have no more regard for them, than for our worst enemies. Then if nations are near, are contiguous, unless their insignificance make us indifferent to them, producing a political removal of the same effect as a geographical one, it is hardly possible to keep friendship, amidst the thou-

sand cross interests that will arise in the way of intercourse. The governments will have an interest to make each other odious, on account of the unavoidable connexion of domestic and foreign politics. This was the case with our own country, during nearly the whole interval from the peace of 1783 to that of 1814. It was no small part of the political tactics, to render England and France respectively odious to the rival parties in our country. And when this object is once achieved, when the domestic parties in a free country are once distinctly associated with the question of the merits of foreign nations, any length of hostility, into which the public feeling may run, is adequately accounted for. It is not the topic, that gives the bitterness ; it is the rival interests, the rising and falling, the out and the in, that are pledged upon the topic. The die, which gives and takes a fortune at a cast, is in itself wholly worthless ; and the people of Hamburg, a hundred years ago, while disputing upon the question, whether, in the Lord's prayer, you should follow the German idiom, and say 'our Father,' or follow the Greek idiom, and say 'Father our,' cut each other's throats with as much zeal as they could have done, in a controversy of the most momentous and eventful nature. We have no doubt, that by far the greater part of the friendly and hostile feeling respectively cherished in this country toward England and France had its origin in the circumstance, that our own domestic politics had become involved in the question of their respective merits ; involved we will not say accidentally, but certainly by a series of causes, in themselves too gradual in their operation to give rise to any great excitement, any farther than they might associate themselves with the leading political divisions. This is confirmed by what has been going on since the peace of 1814. The allaying of party spirit in our country, having deprived the controversy about foreign nations of its principal interest, we have become almost indifferent to France, and it does not enter any body's imagination to like or to dislike her.

The case is singularly different with respect to England. A spirit of hostility to that country seems to be prevailing in ours, and those who, during our political contests, went the farthest in their enmity to Great Britain, are now lost among the throng and mass of the nation, which is getting to breathe the same spirit with unusual unanimity. The imme-

diat causes of this are pretty obvious. The extinction of parties has proved a great damper on the zeal with which we loved and praised Great Britain. We often eulogized Great Britain or France because our political opponents did the same ; and in order to be heartily opposed, one must laud what his adversaries reprobated. But that instead of indifference, as in the case of France, a warm hostility of feeling has taken place in so many minds toward Great Britain, arises, we think, and it does not need Mr. Walsh's book to confirm the opinion, from the indiscriminate and virulent abuse, which has been lately heaped upon America, in English works that circulate too much among us to remain unknown, and with too great authority to be laughed at. There was always, indeed, a strange awkwardness, a game of cross purposes, in the partially felt and expressed in this country toward England, and in England toward America. For it was the opposition to the administration in America that denounced Bonaparte, and sympathised with the English ministry, and was in consequence stigmatized at home as being under British influence. And it was the opposition in England, who resisted the ministry, and who felt but a very qualified jealousy of Bonaparte, that covered the American administration with praises. So that when the American eulogists of England went over to that country, they were bewildered with being embraced as cooperators in sustaining the great cause of continental rights against Britannic encroachment ; and when the English admirers of America entered into explanations, it was always in favour of a policy which the friends of Great Britain in America itself regarded with horror. It was of course idle to expect that so ill compacted an association could long exist, or that any permanent friendship could grow up between nations, when those in each nation, that were nominally the friends of the other, were in reality the most directly in collision, and the opposition in one country sympathised with the administration in the other. It was soon found by the result that much which had been said and done on both sides had been from pure party annoyance ; and the most zealous eulogists of America in the British parliament or the British journals, showed themselves ready to veer to the opposite side of the compass the moment the ministry could with most success be assailed from that quarter. It is now the ministry that will not interfere with

Gen. Jackson or the Florida treaty, and it is the Marquis of Lansdowne and Mr. Tierney that are stirring up the lords and commons on the subject of the cruelty and ambition and the crying assumptions of this aspiring republic. Meantime, we, who like all honest people, wish to be thought and spoken well of in the world, and are sorely perplexed with this pitiless pelting from all quarters, are too apt, it may be, to generalize on the subject, and to suppose that there is a systematic and organized hostility to us in England, when perhaps the symptoms which seem to indicate such an hostility may be more easily accounted for. As far as it is the policy, real or imaginary, of the British government to discourage emigration to the United States, shop-keepers, manufacturers' agents, and Scotch gardeners, *gentlemen*, as lord Grey calls Fearon, will still be deputed to pick up or invent with local probabilities a few unlucky facts, in order to give a colouring to detraction, and frighten away the timid wanderer. Most of the travellers in our country fall within the categories which we have just given; and yet we cheerfully allow it possible for travellers of far different character, of fairer minds, and better breeding than the Englishmen, Scotchmen, and Irishmen, who have commonly honoured us with their visits, to travel through America and return dissatisfied to their native land. What country does please and satisfy, we will not say English travellers, but any travellers? What are the feelings with which an Englishman returns from France, from Italy, from Germany? Is not his pilgrimage through these regions a conflict, a warfare, a long fret? Do not postilions and postmasters, tavern-keepers and landlords, custom-house officers, beggars, and brigands, classes of men alike in all countries and all ages; do not these and a score of other names not less ominous to the experienced traveller, wage a war with the British pilgrim from the quay of Calais back to the white cliffs of Dover, which fills his heart with bitterness to the end of his life; not however preventing him from repeating his trip in two or three years? Or look at a Frenchman in London, what a desolation he feels and shows in a London coffee-house, at a London play, in a London fog; with what yearnings of heart he thinks of Racine and the Français, when he sees elephants and trained dogs on the boards of Covent Garden and Drury Lane; and how he sighs for a cabinet at Very's and Beauvillier's, when with true patriarch-

al simplicity a joint of beef is brought him at George's coffee-house, from which he is to cut his dinner, and from which a half a dozen parties have cut before. And even if all these wondrous grievances, which beset the English traveller on the continent, or the French traveller in England, did not exist, and the pilgrims returned respectively to Paris and London full of the praises of the lands they had visited, what would these praises prove? Nothing but this, that among a thousand national imperfections and social evils, the nations in question happened not to have those which are most afflictive to travellers; this worshipful company being slow to take distinctions between conveniences and virtues, and holding that to be the best country, where the taverns are cleanest, and the post best served.

But we should despair of satisfying English travellers to any great degree, because, however liberal their spirit, it is impossible to become acquainted with a foreign country in a short or even a long excursion through it. The goodness of a land is not built up in its bricks and stones, does not abide in the bridges and turnpikes, nor chaffer on its exchanges; but it retreats to the fireside; it exists, if it exist any where, in family and social circles, it slumbers commonly in everyday times, and only awakes at a loud call, and on a great occasion. The traveller may not be present at these moments, he cannot get an unceremonious admission to these domestic retreats; he makes a few dinner-table acquaintances, picks up a few dates, and names, and facts, and fills up the rest of his book from the geographers, the newspapers, former travellers, and his own imagination. Moreover, he must be a foreigner of singular fairness, who does not partake a sort of jacobinical spirit of fault-finding, which is apt to operate, whenever we judge of any body but our own selves, our own city, our own country. It shows originality to find fault, and wit to detect ridiculous faults; and who would lose the credit of being original or witty, for want of finding or making a few imperfections in a foreign land? In a word, we have given up the idea of ever seeing a book of travels with any pretensions to merit or authority, which would satisfy those most concerned in it, since it came to our knowledge that *Madame de Staël's de l'Allemagne* was the horror of the Germans, for the liberties she takes with Germany; and of the French for the praises she bestows upon it. So that without

supposing any political motive, we may probably never have a book of English travels in America, which will satisfy our demands. And if we should have, if we find a man praising us as zealously as our national vanity would dictate, be sure that it is out of despite to his own countrymen, and that he praises us to disparage them : as is the case with such writers as Cobbett.

Many of the attacks made upon us, especially in the journals of the opposition, may well be ascribed to the personal feeling of the unknown individual who writes them, and not to any supposed party, far less to the nation. A malignant contributor may be charged with the American department ; or an abusive book of travels may have been entrusted, as a happy text to an unlucky wag, who is used to figuring, with success, under this broad cloak of corporate criticism, which covers up our individual weaknesses, and enables us little men to stand boldly under the shadow of a great name. Thus the celebrated review of *Inchiquin's Letters* in the XXII number of the *Quarterly*, which has been damned to a more infamous notoriety than ever before fell to the lot of a piece of criticism, and the article on America in the LXI number of the *Edinburgh Review*, are ascribed respectively, we know not how correctly, to contributors, reverend contributors too, whose names, if divulged, would break the charm of any fancied authority, that now goes with their anonymous opinions ; and show us that the article in the *Edinburgh Review* was from a gentleman, who thinks a witicism, to whatever subject applied, quite as precious as a truth ; and the article in the *Quarterly Review* from another gentleman, who holds a bishopric, by whatever means obtained, to be far goodlier than a deanery.

We do not wish to have it inferred from our remarks, that there is really no settled, regular hostility to America in any portion of the English community. It is, on the contrary, quite natural, that something of the animosity, which was excited by the violent separation of the colonies, by such a stain on the British escutcheon, such a ' robbing of the crown of its brightest jewel,' that something of this animosity should have been transmitted to the present day. All the generation has not passed away, which was engaged immediately in the transactions and scenes, that must have filled so many British hearts with bitterness. All the eyes are not closed, which

saw a vast and fertile continent torn proudly away from their empire. The brother is still living of that misguided minister, who ventured the heavy ship of state into this broken and perilous sea, and the royal hand, which signed the treaty of abdication of sovereignty over this continent, is but just laid motionless.

It can scarcely therefore be expected, that what was so grievous a mortification, at first, should have become a less one, when every year has shown more the richness of the pearl thrown away. If it were a cruel disaster to be dismembered of the comparatively insignificant colonies, the feelings with which that disaster was borne cannot be allayed, by finding how these colonies have grown up and increased ; by finding that they lost not a little belt of population along the margin of the sea, but that mighty throng which is filling the continent, crossing the mountains, pursuing rivers to their source, compared with which the Danube and the Nile are small, and finishing the tour around the globe, which human population had never before achieved, by sitting down on the shores of the Pacific. Moreover, strong deep national impressions remain with a pertinacity in Europe, of which we, whose whole existence has been a succession of great and rapid changes, a course of active development, can hardly conceive. In the countries where no such fermentation is going on, where forms, institutions, families, tenures, and even dwellings, are old, permanent, and hereditary, opinions often descend with as much regularity as estates and titles. It is a matter of course, that he who inhabits the venerable feudal castle today, should think on all great political points as he did who inhabited it thirty years ago. It has been pleasantly observed, that when the emigrants returned to France, after the restoration of Louis XVIII, they ran to the palace, to see whether beau Dillon was still standing as a guard on the Queen's stairs : and in the like spirit there are not wanting English authorities at the present day, who speak of the American revolution as a *rebellion* ; and our brethren of the Quarterly Review allude to the separation of the countries as an event, ' at least as *unfortunate* for America as for England.' Such a spirit resides in the old families, in the church, in the hereditary political parties, though we are willing to own that the world has had such a thorough shaking together, and men have been thrown so often and so widely out of their

track, by the agitations of the French revolution, that there are few periods in English, not to say European, history, in which men have been so little indulged as the present generation, in the glorious privilege of holding to exploded theories, refuted arguments, and political measures, constantly repeated, and constantly discredited in their results.

But it is time to turn our attention particularly to Mr. Walsh's book. We have heard objections to its general design. It is a common remark, at least in this part of the country, that the unavoidable tendency of such vehement recrimination as it is supposed to contain, is to widen the breach, to perpetuate hostile feelings, and to awaken or cherish a bad spirit in our country toward the country, with which some tender associations connect us, and with which as we are to have most of our dealings, it were best to be on courteous terms. We have been calumniated, they say, it is true, but this has mostly been by illiterate and itinerant pretenders, and if the war of defamation is not to be carried on *ad internecionem*, a stop must somewhere be put to it, and we ought to set the example. This course of remark breathes a spirit, which one must commend, but justifies itself by incorrect assumptions. It is not wholly by illiterate and ignorant itinerants that we are calumniated, but by the highest political and literary authority, in the most respectable journals, and on the floor of parliament. That the calumnies which have received the seal of these grave authorities are derived from ignoble and contemptible sources is true : but it is partly this very thing which constitutes the injury, and makes it necessary to vindicate ourselves from charges, which not only their own grossness but the poor authority from which they are derived have not rendered duly suspicious. Neither does it seem to us correct to accuse Mr. Walsh of having taken an injudicious course, in managing this cause. We by no means agree with the remark, which we often hear in this connexion, that to retaliate is not to refute a charge ; and that Mr. Walsh has left our own character undefended, in the zeal with which he has retorted upon the English. In the first place, we suspect that such remarks are usually made by persons, who have not read Mr. Walsh's book themselves, but who have caught up, from conversation or newspaper critiques, an idea that it is filled with nothing but recrimination, and that after having quoted

the various charges made by British writers on us, or aspersions thrown by them on our character, he does nothing but look into the English history and character for an offset. Now though Mr. Walsh has done this last, in many instances, with singular success, yet his process is by no means so compendious as the objection implies. When the calumny consists in a misstatement of facts, he is diligent in rectifying it, and performing the thankless task of putting those right who, not wholly from want of information, were in the wrong. We cannot but quote, as an uncommonly happy instance of this, the following detection of a calumny too gross, and from a source too low to have deserved an honourable man's notice, but that the Earl Grey and our illustrious brethren of the Edinburgh and the Quarterly Reviews have seen fit to lend it the stamp of their authority.

‘But, it is not only of flippancy and rancour that we could convict this traveller, [Fearon] throughout : in several instances he might be shown to be guilty of deliberate, circumstantial falsehood. I will select one which may represent his whole book, and in which the Quarterly Review is implicated. In his report from Philadelphia, dated October 12, 1817, he writes thus :—

“Seeing the following advertisement in the newspapers, put in by the captain and owners of the vessel referred to, I visited the ship, in company with a bootmaker of this city.

‘The passengers on board the brig Bubona, from Amsterdam, and who are willing to engage themselves for a limited time, to defray the expenses of their passage, consist of, &c. Apply on board of the Bubona, opposite Callowhill street, in the river Delaware, or to W. Odlin & Co. No. 38, South Wharves.’

“As we ascended the side of this hulk, a most revolting scene of want and misery presented itself. The eye involuntarily turned for some relief from the horrible picture of human suffering, which this living sepulchre afforded. Mr. ——— inquired if there were any shoemakers on board. The captain advanced : his appearance bespoke his office ; he is an American, tall, determined, and with an eye that flashes with Algerine cruelty. He called in the Dutch language for shoemakers, and never can I forget the scene that followed. The poor fellows came running up with unspeakable delight, no doubt anticipating a relief from their loathsome dungeon. Their cloths, if rags deserve that denomination, actually perfumed the air. Some were without shirts, others had this article of dress, but of a quality as coarse as the worst packing cloth. I inquired of several if they could speak

English. They smiled, and gabbled, 'No Engly, no Engly,—one Engly talk ship.' The deck was filthy. The cooking, washing, and necessary department, were close together. Such is the mercenary barbarity of the Americans who are engaged in this trade, that they crammed into one of those vessels 500 passengers, 80 of whom died on the passage."

'This account is quoted with evident satisfaction, in the Quarterly Review, for May, 1819, and the reviewer adds from himself—"The infamous traffic is confined, exclusively to American vessels."

'I have thought it worth while to ascertain the facts of the case, and they are as follows:—The brig *Bubona* in question was a British vessel, from Sunderland, in England; she was British property, and navigated on British account; her crew was British, and her captain an *Englishman*, by the name of William Garterell. On arriving in the port of Philadelphia, he selected as his factors, the Messrs. Odlin and Co. merchants of that city, whom Fearon falsely represents as the owners of the vessel. The captain was not "tall," but about the middle size, or rather below it, and his countenance had an open, agreeable expression. What is more: of the vessels that entered the port of Philadelphia in the years 1816 and 1817, laden with redemptioners from the continent of Europe, the greater number was foreign; these amounted to ten, of which five were British in British employment; namely, the brig *Bubona*, above mentioned, the ship *Zenophon*, captain Goodwin; the brig *Constantia*, captain Janson; the brig *William*, captain Arrowsmith, and brig *William*, captain Danton.* The condition of the redemptioners on board the British vessels was no better than in the others of whatever nation engaged in the "infamous traffic."

'I derive these particulars from unquestionable sources,—the Mr. Woodbridge Odlin, who transacted the business of the *Bubona*, and Mr. Andrew Leinau, a respectable inhabitant of Philadelphia, who served as general agent for the foreign redemptioner ships, as they were styled, and who has in his hands official vouchers, which I have examined, of their respective national character, the number of their passengers, &c. It is known, moreover, that as soon as the abuses practised in the trade became notorious, the American Congress passed a law designed to prevent the recurrence of them, and remarkable for the humanity and efficaciousness of its precautions.

* The other foreign vessels (Prussian and Hanseatic) were, ship *Vrow Cathrina*, captain John Van Dyle; brig *Bonifacias*, captain Leitman; brig *Concordia*, captain Diedricksen; ship *Vrow Elizabeth*, captain Blankman, &c.

‘ If Fearon really visited the Bubona, which may be doubted, he, an Englishman, could not have mistaken her national character, nor that of the captain. This “tall American, with an eye flashing Algerine cruelty,” is a phantasm manifestly intended to heighten the injurious effect of the whole malignant fiction. So the use of the present tense by the Quarterly Reviewers, in their unwarrantable assertion, argues the design of giving it to be understood, that the trade is still carried on by American vessels, with the same abuses as existed before the passage of the preventive law.’ pp. xxvii.—xxix.

Now will any one say that it is unchristian, or undignified, or promotive of a bad spirit to make such a refutation of such a calumny? Do not the journals, which copy and retail this poor slander, this profligate circumstantial falsehood, do not public and formal compliments from such characters as Lord Grey, who tells you that the author of such fabrications is ‘*a gentleman*, whose book is full of the most valuable information, and is distinguished by the marks not only of an inquiry, observing and intelligent mind, but of the greatest *fairness* and impartiality,’ do not these vouchers make it worth while to refute the calumnies, to which they give their sanction? To deny this, seems to us to be carrying the blessed doctrine of peace-making to a somewhat generous extent.

Having had occasion to allude to Lord Grey, and the generous patronage which he lavishes on a client, likely, we fear, in the end to do his lordship’s discernment and knowledge of character but small credit, we add that his lordship, on an occasion when it most behoved him to be correct, has fallen into an error on the subject of the American political organization, which an English Peer of the first political reputation might have avoided, at least when descanting voluntarily on the topic. He evidently confounds the state politics of Pennsylvania, with the national politics of America; and applies the information which he derived from Fearon, relative to the intrigues at Harrisburgh, to show ‘the operation of their [the Americans] laws, and of this boasted constitution.’ This ignorance indeed is not without the countenance of good company. The Edinburgh reviewers tell us that ‘they know (they really know) that the leaders of the democratic party, who now predominate in their *caucus*, or committee at Washington, do, in effect, nominate to all the important offices of North America!’ Mr. Bentham, who

magnanimously proposed to reorganize our legal systems, and to write us a code of law, talks of 'the President of Congress;' a phraseology which was correct 40 years ago, before the formation of the constitution, and which now is as apt a designation, as 'king of the British Parliament' would be in England. Nay to afford, once for all, a broad ministerial precedent to any degree of ignorance, and grossness of blundering on the subject of America, Lord North, while sending out his fleets and armies to America, and unknitting the bands of the British empire, talks of *the Island of Virginia*.

The mistake, to which we have alluded of Lord Grey and the Edinburgh Review, viz. of confounding the national and state politics of America is, in fact, almost universal abroad. We have never yet seen any discussion of American affairs in Europe, or any attempt to speak definitely of the nature of our political constitutions, which evinced an accurate acquaintance with this fundamental part, this essential feature of our organization, the distinction and limitation of the national and state sovereignties respectively. The European writers, as far as we have had opportunities of informing ourselves, have invariably ascribed too much, either to the national sovereignty on one side, or the state sovereignty on the other. In attempting to compare our confederacy to the Grecian councils and leagues, or to the Germanic body, to none of which has it any further resemblance than the mere name Confederacy carries, they have undervalued that sovereign undivided power, which the people of America have deputed to the national government, in its executive, legislative, and judicial departments. As in the case just quoted of Mr. Bentham, they have not gotten beyond the idea of the old ante-constitutional confederacy. And it is such a confederacy of sovereign and independent states, which the Grecian and the German analogies, just alluded to, lead one to expect. With this idea of our union, the foreign critics and politicians stop; often enough, no doubt, finding countenance for their error, in the loose and fantastical notions of the limits of the national sovereignty, which abound in some parts even of our country. All the foreign civilians, whose judgments on this subject have come to our notice, and we lament to be obliged to add too many Americans to them, as partakers of the same gross misconception of the theory of our government, have spoken of the national

union as a confederacy of the several states ; such it is not and was not meant to be, and the constitution opens with a formal refutation of this error. ‘ *We, THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES*, do ordain and establish this constitution, for the United States of America.’ It is with this express annunciation of the constitution, not as the act of the confederated states, but *of the people* of America, that the charter of our country opens ; and the representation of each state by two members in the senate is the only feature in our political organization, on which to ground for a moment the idea of a compact between the states. It would lead us too far from our present purpose, to inquire into the consistency of such an equal senatorial representation, with the idea of an union, not of the states, but of the people. It is sufficient to say here, that had the union been an union of the states, and not of the people, then not only in the senate, but in the house of representatives, and in the choice of president, the small states should have had an equal voice with the large states, being equally sovereign and independent states ; self-existent communities clothed, in every respect, with the same sovereign power. And as in the community, the poor man has a voice as well as the rich man, and the one is not disparaged by his indigence, nor the other advantaged by his wealth, but each placed on the same level, in the exercise and enjoyment of political privileges ; so in a union of the states, *as states*, each of these separate and independent communities would have had an equal voice, in all the departments of government ; and this of right. For Virginia or New York is not the more a sovereign and independent state for their millions, nor Rhode Island or Delaware the less a state, for their 60 or 70 thousands. That, therefore is, in no sense, a union of the states, in which the states wave all the privilege which they possess as states, and nothing is regarded but the rights of their inhabitants, as individual citizens of the American community. We have been at the more pains to explain this point, because the greatest danger, which our union has to fear, will spring from misconceptions on this head ; and from an idea that as the union is a confederacy of the states, the state interests may be conceived of as separate from those of the union.

But with regard to the ignorance on American politics, which prevails abroad, we observed that those who do not

overrate the national sovereignty, are apt to run into the opposite error, and overrate the state sovereignty. This leads to important misconceptions and gross practical misrepresentations, as when in that outlaw article in the Quarterly Review, an affirmation is made of the judiciary of the United States, which is true only of the judiciaries of some of the single states of the country, viz. that the judges are chosen annually. The states, it is true, are sovereign and independent communities, within certain limits, and for certain purposes; principally those of interior and domestic arrangement and government, and for most of what the continental civilians call *administration*. Within this limit, they are sovereign. They have not a collateral, secondary, or initiative jurisdiction, not an advisory or intermediate one, but an original, ultimate, and exclusive jurisdiction, which they have a right to seal with the blood of any who contravenes it. But the same American people, which has constituted the respective state governments and clothed them with these powers, has constituted another national government, with powers not ultimate over the initiative powers of the state, and not deciding powers over consulting ones in the state. The national government is not by the side of the state governments, nor in their centre; nor yet is it subject to them, nor yet above them. It is different, separate, peculiar; constituted for objects, which it is no part of the business of the state governments to pursue, and void of power over those objects with which the state governments are entrusted. The national government, the majesty of this empire, the authority of Congress, the executive arm, with all the American fleets and armies at its disposal, is weak and motionless in respect to questions of state government. It cannot touch these questions; it cannot try to touch them. With respect to them, the national government does not exist. But in regard to the province of the national government, and on the questions whose decision is entrusted by the American people to that government, here on the other hand, the state sovereignties, in their turn, are weak, are motionless, are mute; they sink into the dust, they do not exist. They do not thus lose any power, for they never had any for these purposes. The same American people which constituted the state sovereignties, constituted the national sovereignty to effect objects, which they did not choose to confide to the states, in any form, or under any

qualification. This is the theory of our national and state governments. It is no metaphysical theory, no plan on paper, spun out of verbal criticism on the terms of the written constitution ; but it is the theory, which every day is exemplifying by ten thousand examples, in our national and state governments, throughout the union. There is no perplexity in this delicate, this grand complication of high sovereign powers, over millions of men, thus curiously discriminated. Our lives and our property are safe, under the wing of the states ; our foreign relations and national interests are administered without confusion of rival sovereignties, by the national government. The national government is relieved of the most oppressive and odious part of governing, the local, interior, and detailed administration. The states are spared that bitter cup of oppression, which comes down from the throne in all other countries, in the hands of prefects, governors, and judges, ‘ that know not Joseph,’ and care not for the people, over which they are sent to rule. Now to think of comparing this beautiful organization of government with any thing, that has been carried into operation in ancient or modern Europe, is solemn trifling with the judgments of men. If we are asked what remedy we have, seeing that the state sovereignty and the national sovereignty, though not clothed with powers referring to each other, either as co-ordinate, subaltern, or ultimate, yet being both moral and political persons, and therefore liable to be brought into collision with each other, through the weakness of humanity, what remedy we have for a case like this, we reply, that we have the Supreme Court of the United States, to judge in all controversies between the states, or a state and the nation. If it be still inquired, what political check we have over the independence and impartiality of this court, in deciding such high national controversies, we answer, first in general the personal responsibility of the president created by the people, and likely therefore to look to their interests in the appointment of judges ; and then for each particular case, the liability of the judges to be impeached before a body returning every six years, in three biennial classes, to the bosom of the people, that elected them. Of this theory of our government, which, if only as a beautiful work of art, if it were but another Eutopian romance, were richly worth the study of every one, who pretends to the name of a politician, of this theory

of our government, though in full practical, genuine, effective operation, we have never yet been able to convince ourselves that the statesmen of Europe, no, not those who are called to administer the greatest national and public interests, in relation to us, or in conjunction with us, have any thing more than some general and indefinite notions, such as the mere sound of the terms carries with them, without the least insight into the genius and real character of our institutions.

But to return to the topic which we were discussing, we are quite unable to comprehend why the duty of forbearance is to begin with us. At whatever point of our history you choose to begin, whether at the expulsion of the puritans from England, at the oppression of the early settlers, at the revolutionary war, or since the peace of 1814, English princes, ministers, and authors, have ever been the assailants, and we apprehend it to be quite fair that we should meet their charges. Let them, when we have done this, see to the duty of putting a stop to the war of recrimination. Moreover, England stands, or claims to stand, on the vantage-ground. She is the old, the powerful, the rich, the wise, and the polite combatant; and we, she will have it, are not only young, but weak, poor, ignorant, and barbarous. Is it then for us, who it seems have so little to lose, to acquiesce patiently in the plunder of that little? The duty of forbearance, of listening without reply, and of leaving it to calumny to refute itself, does *not* belong to us. It is not only lawful for us, but it is our bounden duty to repel it; and we should deserve the abuse which has been heaped upon us, were we so insensible to the value of national reputation as to leave it unrefuted, and, where occasion offers, unreturned. We therefore hold, that Mr. Walsh is not to be censured, even where he confines himself most exclusively to recrimination. Those who have found fault with this course appear to us to have mistaken the object for which America has been slandered, and the general train of the reasoning, with which Mr. Walsh has conducted, as we think with high ability and gratifying success, the cause of national defence. Our country is charged with this and that stain, vice, imperfection, and blot, not as if the charge were to rest there, and when we had been judged by the tribunal of the world's opinion, we were to be acquitted, or sentenced to a penalty, by which the old score would be wiped off, and we should start again in the world. The

calumnies heaped upon us are intended to lead to an *inference*, often to an immediate practical inference, viz. that this America is not a fit country to emigrate to, nor a safe place in which to venture your life, property, and your children's morals. And when no such specific and immediate consequence is drawn from the various direct and indirect, compendious and detailed attacks on us and our character, there is always intended the general inference that America, in consequence of these opprobrious premises, is an inferior, unworthy country, not fit to enter on equal terms, and with unblemished character, into the intercourse of the nations. Now if we can take a recognized example of a nation that stands, not only an equality, but, in her own opinion, on a high vantage-ground among the nations, and can match in her condition, character, or history, the very imperfections charged on us ; still more, if this nation should happen to be the very one which has busied herself in vilifying us, then we have proved by her own confession, that even allowing the charges to be true, the disparaging consequence against us which she draws from them is unjust : then we have proved by her own confession, that we may be virtuous and free in despite of all which her travellers have found or invented, and her critics copied and reasoned to our discredit. We say that Mr. Walsh does not confine himself within the limits which this course of reasoning indicates ; but if he did, he would be borne out by sound logic. Moreover, this course is the more compendious, since it makes it unnecessary to inquire whether the calumnious charges against us are true or not ; a task, however, as we have already stated, which Mr. Walsh does not spare himself. His purpose in general is expressed in the following sentence from the preface.

‘ My purpose in this undertaking generally, is not merely to assert the merits of this calumniated country ; I wish to repel actively, and, if possible, to arrest, the war which is waged without stint or intermission, upon our national reputation. This, it now appears to me, cannot be done without combating on the offensive ; without making inroads into the quarters of the restless enemy.’

It would not be necessary, did our limits permit us, to follow Mr. Walsh through the whole of his work, or examine with what success each particular part of it is executed.

Having already passed through two editions in this country and one in England, it will be more than sufficient to offer our readers a brief analysis of the plan pursued, with a few remarks on one or two of the more prominent topics.

In a preface, intended not so much to serve as an introduction to the work as a sample of it, and to prepare the mind of the reader as well for the nature of the warfare which has been waged upon us, as for the manner in which Mr. Walsh repels it, a few striking, and we may add, unpardonable instances of British calumny are cited and commented upon. Of these we have already extracted what relates to one. The scandalous epilogue to a play of Terence, spoken at Westminster school, is another; a third discloses itself in the course taken by the opposition in parliament relative to the Seminole war and the conduct of Gen. Jackson; and a fourth is a most preposterous and quixotic assault which an honest gentleman of the name of Moore, member, ye must know, of the Royal College of Surgery, has seen fit to make on the literary, scientific, and moral character of the United States, in—‘the history and practice of vaccination.’ These are well chosen examples; for they show that it is not enough for vulgar itinerants, in the character of travellers, to calumniate us in their journals, nor for politicians to praise or vilify us, as may best serve them in the game of opposition they have to play: but that the public sentiment toward us must be poisoned in its first springs, the youthful mind, and in its most sacred reservoirs, the volumes of scientific and learned research.

The first section of Mr. Walsh's work dwells on the *political and mercantile jealousy* of Great Britain, and shows it to have been contemporaneous with the foundation of the first American settlements. Few, we fear, of this good-natured generation, who will have the duty of forgiving, and overlooking, and conciliating to come first from us, are aware how early this spirit began, and to what lengths it went. We are accustomed to hear with horror of the measures taken to prevent the instruction and education of negro slaves. What shall we say to the following chapter in our colonial history.

‘From the same motive, printing presses were denied to the plantations. We are told by Chalmers, that “no printing press was allowed in Virginia;” that “in New England and New York there were assuredly none *permitted*,” and that “the other

provinces probably were not more fortunate.”* When Andros was appointed by James II captain-general of all the northern colonies, he was instructed “to allow of no printing press.” In an official report of Sir William Berkeley, governor of Virginia, dated 20th June, 1671, there is the following characteristic passage:—“I thank God we have no free schools, nor any printing; and I hope we shall not have them these hundred years. For learning has brought disobedience, and heresy, and sects into the world, and printing has divulged them and libels against the best government: God keep us from both.” Accordingly every effort was made to shut out the pestilent tree of knowledge. On the appointment of Lord Effingham to the government of Virginia, in 1683, he was ordered, agreeably to the prayer of Sir William Berkeley, “to allow no person to use a printing press on any occasion whatever.”

The policy which dictated measures like these, went only to keep in ignorance and darkness that portion of America which had been opened and settled. It was another step in the same oriental spirit, which laid it down as a rule that the colonization was to be confined as much as possible to the coast, and the settlement of the interior as far as possible discouraged. That even this age in which we live is not too humane for an idea of the same kind, is fresh in the annals of the negotiations at Ghent, of which Sir James Mackintosh admirably says, ‘more barbarous than the Norman tyrants, who afforested great tracts of arable land for their sport, ministers attempted to stipulate that a territory, quite as great as the British islands, should be doomed to an eternal desert. They laboured to prevent millions of freemen and christians from coming into existence. To perpetuate the English authority in two provinces, a large part of North America was to be forever a wilderness. The American negotiators, by their resistance to so insolent and extravagant a demand, maintained the common cause of civilized men.’ Though it be possible to conceive of so hungry a spirit of political aggrandizement, that the British ministry should be willing to secure the Canadian provinces and obstruct the progress of the American power, by drawing this cordon of everlasting desolation along the western frontier; yet who could have been prepared for this benighted policy, when applied to check the growth of their own colonies, their own

* ‘Political Annals of the United Colonies, chap. 15.’

children, their own fellow subjects? Who could have believed that, at the period when the British sovereignty was undisputed in America, and the name of Briton was jealously arrogated to himself by every American, as his title to glory, that even then it should be the assumed and fixed policy of the paternal councils of England, to keep the continent of America, as far as possible, in the savage state, in which they found it?

‘To lessen the danger, or obviate new hazards, for her sovereignty and monopoly, England embraced the policy, of confining the settlements in North America as much as possible to the sea coast. The great points of preventing the French power from being immoveably established at their back, and over the whole vast interior; of securing the Atlantic provinces not only from this evil, but from their cruel scourge—the Indians; of opening the fruitful and beautiful countries beyond the Apalachian mountains to English cultivation and empire, were all postponed to views, of which it is difficult to say whether they were more selfish or short-sighted. The plan of a colony on the Ohio, for the salutary and noble purposes just enumerated, was conceived in America in the middle of the last century, submitted fruitlessly to the British government in 1768, and offered anew by Dr. Franklin, in 1770. with the engagement on the part of the projectors, to be at the whole expense of establishing and maintaining the civil administration of the country to be settled. A few extracts from the two Reports* of the Board of Trade and Plantations, on the subject, to the lords of the privy council, will explain the favourite system in relation to the plantations.

“The proposition of forming inland colonies in America is, we humbly conceive, entirely new: it adopts principles in respect to American settlements, different from what have hitherto been the policy of this kingdom, and leads to a system which, if pursued through all its consequences, is, in the present state of that country, of the greatest importance.

“And first with regard to the policy, we take leave to remind your lordships of that principle which was adopted by this Board, and approved and confirmed by his majesty, immediately after the treaty of Paris, viz. the confining the western extent of settlements to such a distance from the sea coast, as that those settlements should lie *within the reach of the trade and commerce of this kingdom*, upon which the strength and riches of it depend; and also of the exercise of that authority and jurisdiction, which

* ‘Fourth vol. Franklin’s Works, article Ohio Settlement.’

was conceived to be necessary for the preservation of the colonies, in a due subordination to, and dependence upon, the mother country; and these we apprehend to have *been two capital objects of his majesty's proclamation* of the 7th of October, 1763, by which his majesty declares it to be his royal will and pleasure, to reserve, under his sovereignty, protection, and dominion, for the use of the Indians, all the lands not included within the three new governments, the limits of which are described therein, as also all the lands and territories lying to the westward of the sources of the rivers which shall fall into the sea from the west and north-west, and by which all persons are forbid to make any purchases or settlements whatever, or to take possession of any of the lands above reserved, without special license for that purpose.

"The same principles of policy, in reference to settlements at so great a distance from the sea coast as to be out of the reach of all advantageous intercourse with this kingdom, continue to exist in their full force and spirit: and though various propositions for erecting new colonies in the interior parts of America have been, in consequence of this extension of the boundary line, submitted to the consideration of government, (particularly in that part of the country wherein are situated the lands now prayed for, with a view to that object.) yet the dangers and disadvantages of complying with such proposals have been so obvious, as to defeat every attempt made for carrying them into execution." pp. 15, 16.

The second section is entitled *the General Character and Merits of the Colonies*, and contains a proud enumeration of facts and testimonies, which do honour to the memory of our ancestors from the earliest emigration. We counsel those, who are fond of repeating the ribaldry about the descent of the Americans from convicts, to look over this chapter with some care. The pages devoted to a palliation of the religious intolerance, in Massachusetts, have a particular interest for us here, and we cannot forbear to offer our readers a part of what is said by Mr. Walsh, on the subject of the trials and executions for witchcraft.

"I would not hesitate to concede to the author of "the British empire in America," that "the great foible of the New England history is the story of the witches."* But this story has aspects widely different from that under which it is exhibited abroad. Belief in witchcraft was epidemic in the seventeenth century, and could not fail to extend to New England. The insulated situation of her inhabitants, one which presents them, to use their

* 'Preface.'

own graphic language, as "conflicting with many grievous difficulties and sufferings in the vast howling wilderness, among wild men and wild beasts,"* the austerity of their domestic habits, the solemnity of their religious feelings, the terrific dangers to which they were hourly exposed, their daily intercourse with the Indians, whose conversation was perpetually of demons and necromancers, the new maladies of body, resulting from a new and crude climate, the heart sickening recollections of "the pleasant land of their nativity," of which the ravening brood of tyrants would almost be forgotten, as memory recalled its better features, with the enjoyments and ties of their youth, all these influences combined against the force of their reason, and contributed to render irresistible the contagion of the European superstition. The simple example of the mother country might account for their infatuation; and the extent, to which it is chargeable upon that example, may be understood, from the following passage of Hutchinson's History of Massachusetts. "Not many years before the delusion seized New England, Glanville published his witch stories in England; Perkins and other Nonconformists were earlier; but the great authority was that of Sir Matthew Hale, revered in New England, not only for his knowledge in the law, but for his gravity and piety. The trial of the witches in Suffolk was published in 1684. All these books were in New England, and the conformity between the behaviour of Goodwin's children and most of the supposed bewitched at Salem, and the behaviour of those in England, is so exact as to leave no room to doubt the stories had been read by the New England persons themselves, or had been told to them by others who had read them. Indeed, this conformity, instead of giving suspicion, was urged in confirmation of the truth of both; the Old England demons and the New being so much alike. The court justified themselves from books of law, and the authorities of Keble, Dalton, and other lawyers, then of the first character, who laid down rules of conviction as absurd and dangerous as any which were practised in New England."†

* All ranks in Scotland and England concurred in raising a complete demonocracy for those countries, throughout the seventeenth century. Lord Kaimes asserts, in his *Sketches of the History of Man*, that during the civil wars every one belived in magic, charms, spells, sorcery, and witchcraft. An incident related by Evelyn, for which no parallel is to be found in American history, shows the temper of the times, in England. "29th March, 1652 — was that celebrated eclipse of the sun, so much threatened by

* 'Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts to the king. (1680.)'

† 'Vol. ii. chap. i.'

the astrologers, and which had so exceedingly alarmed the whole nation, that hardly any one would work or stir out of their houses, so ridiculously were they abused by knavish and ignorant stargazers." The Long parliament, alias, "the great reformation parliament," issued several commissions "to discover and prosecute witches," and upon those commissions were many unfortunate persons, of both sexes, tried and executed. We should not forget the testimony of Hume, with respect to the state of Scotland, at the period in question. "The fanaticism which prevailed, acquired, besides the malignants and engagers, a new object of abhorrence. These were the sorcerers. So prevalent was the opinion of witchcraft, that great numbers, accused of that crime, were burnt by sentence of the magistrates, through all parts of Scotland. In a village near Berwick, which contained only fourteen houses, fourteen persons were punished by fire, and it became a science every where much studied and cultivated, to distinguish a true witch by proper trials and symptoms."*

For thirty years after the settlement of Massachusetts, while victims were daily sacrificed by fire and the rope, in Great Britain, none suffered for witchcraft in that colony. Hutchinson asserts truly, that "more were put to death in a single county of England for that cause, than suffered in New England from the planting until his time, in 1760."† The phrenzy endured in America but seven months; whereas it may be said to have continued, with little or no abatement, in the mother country, in Scotland particularly, for a long series of years. If Cotton Mather partook of the wretched delusion, he was at least as excusable as Sir Matthew Hale; and we may doubt whether there was any learned judge of New England, cotemporary with chief justice Blackstone, who would have gravely summed up the evidence respecting the reality of witchcraft, and as gravely decided it to be "most eligible to conclude, that, in general, such a thing as witchcraft had been."‡ North America, of the eighteenth century, can furnish no counterpart for the story of the Cocklane ghost. Hutchinson has, on this subject, some observations in addition to those I have quoted from him, which ought not to be withheld. "The trial of Richard Hatheway, the impostor, before lord chief justice Holt, was ten or twelve years after of the trials in New England. This was a great discouragement to prosecutions in England for witchcraft, but an effectual stop was not put to them until the act of parliament in the reign of his late majesty,

* 'Chapter 59.'

† 'Hist. of Mass. vol. ii. chap. i.'

‡ 'Commentaries, b. iv. c. iv. "Witchcraft or sorcery is a truth to which every nation in the world, hath, in its turn, borne testimony, by either examples seemingly well attested, or prohibitory laws, which at least suppose the possibility of a commerce with evil spirits."

George II. Even this did not wholly cure the common people, and we hear of old women ducked and cruelly murdered within these last twenty years. Reproach, then, for hanging witches, although it has been often cast upon the people of New England by those of Old, yet it must have been done with an ill grace." pp. 52—55.

The third section treats of *the difficulties surmounted by the Colonists*, and proves how vain and false as well as injurious, was the querulous language held toward them from an early period, as if they had enjoyed an unusual measure of aid and protection from the parent government. We cannot withhold the following specimen of the protection and aid vouchsafed them.

‘The courageous loyalty of Virginia, although acknowledged and applauded on the restoration, turned still less to her advantage than the republicanism of New England. A scheme of restriction and a train of measures, more prejudicial and galling than those of Cromwell, were pursued by Charles II and his successor, towards those who boasted with truth, “that they were the last of the King’s subjects who renounced, and the first who resumed their allegiance.” “With the restoration,” says Chalmers, “began a series of evils which long afflicted, and well nigh ruined the plantation of Virginia.” One of these evils was, the distribution among certain favourite adherents of Charles II in England, of a large portion of the soil, including cultivated estates, held by every right which could vest indefeasible property. “Virginia,” says the writer whom I have just quoted, “beheld the Northern Neck, containing one half of the whole, given away to strangers, who had shared neither the danger nor expenses of the original settlement.”’*

A spoliation no less iniquitous was attempted, and partly accomplished by Andros, in 1688, in New England. There, on the lawless abolition of all the charters, a declaration followed, that the titles of the colonists to their lands had become void in consequence. By this monstrous fiction of tyranny, the oldest proprietors were summoned to take out, at a heavy cost, new patents for estates acquired by purchase from the Indians; possessed for near sixty years; defended against the inroads of a barbarous enemy, at the hazard of life, and improved with incessant toil and immense expense. Hutchinson remarks,† that according to the computation then made, all the personal estate of Massachusetts would not have paid the charge of the new patents required in

* ‘Annals, ch. iv.’

† ‘Vol. i. c. iii.’

that colony. A scheme of despotism and rapine so exorbitant, could not be long prosecuted with a people that had made such sacrifices for freedom, and had lost nothing of their pristine fervor. It was quickly terminated by the popular insurrection at Boston, already noticed, which deposed all its abettors, and extinguished the government of James in New England. What is called the rebellion of Bacon, in the annals of Virginia, sprung from grievances of equal injustice, and wanted, I am inclined to think, nothing but ultimate success, to make it, in the estimation of all, equally noble with the bold and characteristic movement of Massachusetts.* p. 78.

The fourth section relates *the Military efforts of the Colonies*, and the ungrateful return made by Great Britain, and yields perhaps in interest to no portion of the volume. Mr. Walsh has here collected, with great diligence, very curious details relative to the military expeditions, in which the colonies took a part, and to the manner in which their services were acknowledged by the mother country. By way of recapitulation, at the end of the section, are given some highly interesting extracts from a speech in parliament of David Hartley in 1775. We regret that we can make but one quotation from his remarks.

“ Whenever Great Britain has declared war, they have taken their part. They were engaged in king William's wars, and queen Anne's, even in their infancy. They conquered Acadia in the last century, for us ; and we then gave it up. Again, in queen Anne's war, they conquered Nova Scotia, which, from that time, has always belonged to Great Britain. They have been engaged in more than one expedition to Canada, ever foremost to partake of honour and danger with the mother country.

“ Well, Sir, what have we done for them? Have we conquered the country for them from the Indians? Have we cleared it? Have we drained it? Have we made it habitable? What have we done for them? I believe, precisely nothing at all, but just keeping watch and ward over their trade, that they should receive nothing but from ourselves, at our own price. I will not positively say that we have spent nothing ; though I don't recollect any such article upon our journals : but I mean any material expense in setting them out as colonists. The royal military government of Nova Scotia cost, indeed, not a little sum ; above \$500,000 for its plantation, and its first years. Had your other

* ‘ This opinion is fully sustained by Burk's narrative of Bacon's rebellion.—See vol. ii. ch. iv. History of Virginia.’

colonies cost any thing similar either in their outset or support, there would have been something to say on that side ; but, instead of that, they have been left to themselves for one hundred or one hundred and fifty years, upon the fortune and capital of private adventurers, to encounter every difficulty and danger. What towns have we built for them ? What desert have we cleared ? What country have we conquered for them from the Indians ? Name the officers—name the troops—the expeditions—their dates. Where are they to be found ? Not in the journals of this kingdom. They are no where to be found.

“ In all the wars which have been common to us and them, they have taken their full share. But in all their own dangers, in the difficulties belonging separately to their situation, in all the Indian wars which did not immediately concern us, we left them to themselves to struggle their way through.—For the whim of a minister, you can bestow half a million to build a town, and to plant a royal colony of Nova Scotia ; a greater sum than you have bestowed upon every other colony together.

“ And notwithstanding all these, which are the real facts, now that they have struggled through their difficulties, and begin to hold up their heads, and to show that empire which promises to be the foremost in the world, we claim them and theirs, as implicitly belonging to us, without any consideration of their own rights. We charge them with ingratitude, without the least regard to truth, just as if this kingdom had, for a century and a half, attended to no other object ; as if all our revenue, all our power, all our thought had been bestowed upon them, and all our national debt had been contracted in the Indian wars of America ; totally forgetting the subordination in commerce and manufactures, in which we have bound them, and for which, at least, we owe them help towards their protection.”’ pp. 138, 139.

The fifth section is upon the *Commercial obligations of Great Britain* to America, and gives an imposing view of the nourishment, which the commerce and manufactures of England have, from the earliest period, derived from her connexion with this country ; a view the less obnoxious to exception as being founded on numerical statements and results. One is surprised to observe how early the beneficial operation of this connexion began. No later than 1665, Sir Josiah Child thus writes.

“ England has constantly improved in people, since our settlement upon the plantations in America. We are very great gainers by the direct trade of New with Old England. Our yearly

exportations of English manufactures, malt and other goods from hence thither, amounting in my opinion, to ten times the value of what is imported from thence, which calculation I do not make at random, but upon mature consideration, and peradventure upon as much experience in this trade, as any other person will pretend to.”*

That what was thus true, at the earliest period of our colonial history, continued to be so during the interval that elapsed before the revolutionary war, there is abundant evidence contained in the statements, which the debates on that war drew out in the English parliament, particularly from Lord Chatham and Mr. Burke; and that the benefits reaped by Great Britain from her intercourse with us, since our independence, have, instead of decreasing, been augmented in an almost unimagined ratio in consequence of that separation, “at least as injurious to America as to England,” may be admitted on the following unsuspecting authority.

‘A distinguished member of the British parliament, Mr. Alexander Baring, examined fully in 1808, with the advantages of practical knowledge and much general commercial learning, the question of her increased utility, and pronounced that, upon the whole, she had, in her independent situation, to a greater degree than could have been expected from any other, been the means of augmenting the British resources, in the war with the continental powers—that she contributed in the highest degree possible, all the benefits which one nation could derive from the existence of another, or that a mother country could receive from that of the best regulated colony.† The same inquirer ascertained, that three-fourths of the money proceeding from the consumption of the produce of the soil of America, in all parts of the world, were paid to Great Britain for her manufactures. He developed other benefits, the reality of which did not admit of dispute, and found it unpardonable “that his countrymen should entertain a jealousy of the prosperity and wealth American independence had produced, which not only served to circulate the produce of their industry, where they could not carry it themselves, but by increasing the means of America, augmented in the same proportion her consumption of that produce, at a time when the loss of their former customers, by the persecutions of France, rendered it most valuable.”’ p. 162.

* ‘Discourse on Trade, chap. x.’

† ‘Examination of the Orders in Council, &c.’

These sentiments do honour to the distinguished person, who expressed them. In return, we are fully willing to own, that this connexion between England and America, which has been so profitable to her, has been equally so to us. Had it not been so to us, it could not of course have continued and increased. Nothing but our own unexampled prosperity, of which the trade with England has certainly not been one of the least of the immediate causes, could have enabled us to pay to that country the tribute of such an enormous commerce of consumption. Our own commercial operations have of course been constantly facilitated and extended by the credit obtained of the English merchant and manufacturer, and the intercourse of the nations has been, as we would ever have it, highly advantageous to both.

An account is given in the sixth section of *the relative dispositions of Great Britain and America*, from the peace of 1763. In this section the sentiments felt and avowed and the measures proposed and attempted, in that heyday of British madness, the period which immediately preceded our revolution and the period of the revolution itself, are passed in brief review. The character of the British ministry, at the breaking out of the war, is thus portrayed by a pencil, that carries with it equal authority and power.

‘Lord Chatham, in concluding the defence of his plan of Conciliation at the sitting of the Lords of the 1st February, 1775, apostrophized the ministers of the day thus :

“Yet when I consider the whole case as it lies before me, I am not much astonished ; I am not surprised that men who hate liberty should detest those that prize it ; or that those who want virtue themselves, should endeavour to persecute those who possess it. Were I disposed to carry this theme to the extent that truth would fully bear me out in, I could demonstrate that the whole of your political conduct has been one continued series of weakness, temerity, despotism, ignorance, futility, negligence, blundering, and the most notorious servility, incapacity, and corruption. On reconsideration, I must allow you one merit, a strict attention to your own interests ; in that view, you appear sound statesmen and able politicians. You well know if the present measure (of reconciliation with the colonies) should prevail, that you must instantly lose your places. I doubt much whether you will be able to keep them on any terms : but sure I am, that such are your well known characters and abilities, any plan of reconciliation, however moderate, wise, and feasible, must fail in your

hands. Such, then, being your precarious situation, who can wonder that you should put a negative on any measure which must annihilate your power, deprive you of your emoluments, and at once reduce you to that state of insignificance, for which God and nature designed you." pp. 181, 182.

Mr. Walsh produces some authority for believing, if indeed the proposition required any authority, that the sentiments of those in England, who espoused the cause of pacification at the end of the war, did no great credit to their generosity. Nor is there wanting testimony from the most competent English sources, that the exasperations of the original dismemberment have existed in Great Britain to the present day.

The seventh and eighth sections of Mr. Walsh's work treat of *the hostilities of the British reviews*. This is one of the most fruitful topics in the controversy, and one that might furnish the most ample occasion to our own remarks, did our limits permit. We are not without hopes of being able to offer our readers some remarks on several of the subjects discussed in these sections, on a future occasion. It would be impossible to give our readers an adequate idea of the contents of these sections, by any process short of a minute analysis. We would therefore refer them directly to the sections themselves, as in a high degree curious and instructive.

On one point, of very favourite recurrence in the English journals, viz. the state of the English language in America, we beg leave to trouble the reader, with the fruit of our own poor speculations. If there be any one fact, which forces itself upon the observation of an American in travelling in England, it is this, that in *every* part of the interior of that country, the language is far worse spoken, than in *any* part of America. We speak now of the illiterate and poorly educated portion of the community, in each country; and we submit it fearlessly to any person, who has had the means of making the comparison, and is at all qualified to do it, whether one might not rather suppose that America were the native country of the language, and England a remote colony, exposed to all the chances of corruption, so villanously is the language spoken in all the provinces of the latter country, so wholly distorted in a score of rustic jargons, that do not deserve the name of dialects. What, for instance, shall be said of English, of a sort like the following.

‘ Away I sleenged ; to Grandy meade my mean ;
My Grandy (God be wud her now she’s geane)
Skilfu’ the gushen bluid wi’ cockwebs staid,
Then on the sair a healen plaister laid.
The healen plaister eased the painfal sair,
The arr indeed remains, but neathing mair.’

Specimens of the Cumberland dialect at the end of West’s Guide to the Lakes.

Now this, so far from being an exaggerated specimen, is, we assure our readers, quite softened down and polished from the jargon, actually heard in Cumberland or Westmoreland. And in what benighted corner of America, on what savage frontier, where civilized and barbarous life are shaded into each other, will you meet with English so corrupt, as that which is spoken by the peasantry in Somersetshire or Yorkshire? But it will be perhaps insinuated, that it is of the language of books, the language of the educated part of the community, that English critics mean to speak, when they assert the degeneracy of the language in America. Here, too, an equal injustice is done us. In the first place, it might, without any stretch of charity, be taken for granted, that the language is spoken in America as in England, because we reprint ten English books to one original American one, and however corrupt the latter might be, it could not be supposed that the small alloy, thus thrown into the language, would materially debase the whole mass of pure English, kept constantly current, by the unlimited circulation of English books. Our ancestors were, a great portion of them, well educated men, and must have brought with them the language, as it existed in England among the educated classes in their day. Since their emigration, a period of one or two hundred years, the English language has been going through a constant series of changes, among all who speak it. That every one of these changes, which may have taken place in England, should have found its way across the Atlantic since the active tide of emigration has ceased to flow, and been incorporated into the original stock of the language as our fathers brought it with them, is not to be expected. And that any of the changes, which time may have made in the language among us, from the operation of the same causes, and in the lapse of the same period, should find their way to England, and be knowingly owned by our brethren there, no one could flatter himself would ever happen. But that every innovation,

which has taken place since the time of Shakspeare or of Milton in the English language, in England, should be recognized as of authority, and every change, which has taken place in the language in America, in the same interval, should be stigmatized as a corruption, we see no good reason in philology or common sense ; it appears to us mere arrogant pedantry. A very faithful collection of supposed Americanisms has been given to the public, in the Vocabulary of Mr Pickering. We have examined that work carefully, and find that a considerable portion of the pretended Americanisms are unjustly so called, being English words used in English acceptations. Another considerable portion are provincial words, brought no doubt from the provinces by the emigrants. A small portion are English words, in new senses, and a still smaller new words. Now we challenge any critic, who shall still maintain the corruption of the English language in America, to assume whatever standard he may choose of the English, the standard of dictionaries, or of good writers, or of good company ; and whatever standard be taken, we engage to detect in English writers of respectable standing, and in respectable English society, more provincialisms, more good words in false acceptations, and more newly coined words, than can be found in an equal number of American writers, or in American society, of the same relative respectability. We think we should begin such a comparison with the number of the Edinburgh Review for March, 1817, which formerly fell into our hands, while these ideas were occurring to us. For in the *first article* of that number we fell upon forty-six words not authorized by the standards of our language. The English language corrupted in America ! What are the Columbiads, or Webster's Dictionaries, or any other name of American innovation, compared with the lucubrations of Jeremy Bentham ! We cannot here forbear to present our readers with a passage from a *jeu d'esprit*, which has fallen in our way, under the name of ' Report of Resolutions to be proposed in the House of Representatives.' These proposed resolutions are intended to return the compliment paid to us by the Marquis of Lansdowne, in the session of 1819, in moving for an inquiry into the conduct of Gen. Jackson. In order to show that we are as willing to aid our brethren, in the British Parliament, in inquiring into their affairs, as they to aid our representatives, in inquiring into ours, these proposed resolutions go

over most of the points in the British policy and condition, which appear to us here to need a little revision. That, to which we now allude, is as follows :

‘Whereas the House of Representatives, in common with the people of America, is justly proud of its admirable native tongue, and regards this most expressive and energetic language as one of the best of its birth-rights. Resolved that the House acknowledge with gratitude the zeal, which several respectable writers and critics in England have shown for the preservation of the purity of the language in America ; and, although these writers and critics, misled by the reports of illiterate English travellers, whose breeding and education confined them to the society of the more ignorant part of our community, have indiscriminately stigmatized as Americanisms, words, which may be vulgarisms, or individual or provincial peculiarities, but are in no way adopted at large, by the well educated people of America ; and although the aforesaid critics and writers, being but imperfectly read in the early English writers, the great masters and standards of the language, have also denounced as Americanisms certain other words, such as *to progress, to advocate, &c.* which be, nevertheless, words of approved use and authority in the Augustan age of English literature ; nevertheless, the House is grateful to these writers and critics, for their kind efforts abovementioned, and particularly for the *amiable spirit and courteous tone*, in which they have been made : and whereas the House of Representatives of the United States of America will ever feel it a duty to watch, with jealousy, over the preservation of the English tongue, in its original purity, and it is a matter of great interest to the House and to the American people, that their native language should not degenerate in the parent state, and it would afflict the American people to find their brethren in England gradually contracting the habit of a mixed and barbarous jargon, therefore resolved, that the House of Representatives of the United States of America regard with unfeigned sorrow the continued prevalence of five or six languages or dialects, within the narrow compass of the British isles, as a circumstance which menaces, at no remote period, the radical corruption of the English tongue ; that it is a matter of high astonishment to the House, that no measures have been employed to exterminate the native dialects of the Celtic, still spoken in Cornwall, in Wales, in Ireland, in the Isle of Man, and in Scotland, with the corrupt French in the isles of Jersey and Guernsey ; dialects mutually different from each other, and from the English, and which cannot continue to be spoken, without disastrous consequences to the English language and literature ; that the

House, moreover, looks with still greater anxiety on the utterly corrupt and barbarous state, to which the English language has already sunk, in most of the counties of England, to the degree that the various dialects which prevail, such as those in Yorkshire, Somersetshire, and Cumberland, at the same time that they are in themselves utterly uncouth and hideous, are unintelligible to any one, but a person born and educated in these counties respectively; and though the House views with more respect the lowland dialect of Scotland, as having been ennobled by the writings of some admirable original authors, particularly in the last and present centuries, yet the House still trembles at the deleterious effect, which this very ennobling of a subordinate and provincial dialect may have on the pure English tongue, and regards it as a symptom of the approaching degeneracy of that tongue, that writings in said provincial dialect are eagerly sought and familiarly read; that the House farther regards, as still more pernicious either than the prevalence of the Cornish, Welsh, Erse, Mankish, or Gaelic, or of the provincial corruptions of the English, that barbarity which from various causes is fast creeping into the language of the highest and best educated classes of society in England, a corruption which, in some respects, the House thinks to have been much promoted by the leading critical journals of the day; an affectation, at one time, of forgotten old words, and at another of pedantic new ones, each equally unauthorized in a pure and chaste style of writing and of speaking; the perpetual recurrence of the plural number, instead of the singular, as *charities, sympathies, tendencies, &c.* a phraseology, which tends in a high degree to weaken a language, by leading writers and speakers to place that emphasis in the grammatical plurality, which ought to reside in the term itself; an unwise attempt to ennoble such words as *clever, you know, vastly, &c.* which are pardonable only in colloquial use, and unworthy the dignity of grave and sustained discourse; an adoption by noblemen, gentlemen, and clergymen, of the terms of horse-jockeys, boxers, and shooters, to the degree, that a great number of vulgar and cant terms are heard in what are called the best circles, which the House has reason to apprehend are often the worst, in which the human blood, drawn by the clenched fist of a ruffian, is unrighteously called "claret," and shooting two dozen of birds, "bagging 12 pair of cocks;" lastly, an alarming prevalence of profane and obscene language, in the highest and best bred circles, which, though liable to high moral objections, the House is willing to regard here merely as another agent of brutalizing the English tongue, and which, though it is unhappily a vice too common in all countries, the House has unquestioned information, prevails in

England to an unparalleled and odious extent, reaching into the societies which consider themselves the most polite and best bred. In view of these facts, Resolved, that the House of Representatives of the United States of America is apprehensive, that the genuine purity of the English tongue is already fatally assailed, and is threatened with being wholly destroyed at no remote period : that the possibility of such an event is to be considered by the American people as a just ground of national alarm and apprehension, and that it is their duty to provide, if it may be, against its occurrence : and inasmuch as the circumstances, that this country was at first in general settled by Englishmen of good education, by aggrieved gentlemen and ejected clergymen, and has continued to this day, remarkably free from all those classes of men, which most corrupt a language, such as an accumulation of miners, manufacturers, and beggars, and is blessed, to an extent elsewhere unknown, with the means of popular education, so much so, that in more than one of the American states, it is supposed that there is not a native citizen unable to read and write ; inasmuch as from these and other circumstances easy to be deduced from the previous enumeration of some of the causes of the corruption of the language in England, the English language has been preserved in a state of admirable purity, in the United States of America, a purity so great, that in the most remote and unfavoured portions of our country, the popular dialect is far purer than in some counties in the heart of England, while the style of speaking and writing is, by the blessing of God, quite untainted with most of the above mentioned vulgarities prevalent in the high English circles, and but partially infected with any of them: Resolved, therefore, farther, in consideration of these premises, that the nobility and gentry of England be courteously invited to send their elder sons, and such others as may be destined to appear as public speakers in church or state, to America, for their education ; that the president of the United States be requested to concert measures with the presidents and heads of our colleges and schools, for the prompt reception and gratuitous instruction of such young persons, and to furnish them, after the expiration of a term of _____ years, certificates of their proficiency in the English tongue.' pp. 12—15.

We look upon the above as a fair piece of good natured insolence, quite excusable in the way of retaliation, and fraught, moreover, with a very large portion of truth. But we must hasten to the last great topic of Mr. Walsh's work.

It is well known that one of the most severe attacks, ever made against this country in a respectable quarter, is

the one contained in an article in the LXI number of the Edinburgh Review, to which article and its supposed author, we alluded at the beginning of our remarks. A few facts will show with what justice America is reproached by England, on the score of negro slavery. 1. This disastrous institution was set up in the colonies, under English laws, and for the benefit of English traders. This of course needs no proof. 2. The colonies became early dissatisfied with the existence of negro slavery among them, and made various attempts to prohibit its further introduction by law, attempts uniformly defeated by the British governors acting under express instructions of the English ministry. There are many flagrant instances of this, in the history of several of the colonies, but the following will give our readers, in the shortest compass, the best idea of the state of this part of the controversy.

‘In 1772, most of the duties previously imposed [on the importation of slaves into Virginia] were reenacted, and the Assembly transmitted, at the same time, a petition to the throne, which speaks almost all that could be desired for the confusion of our slanderers. Judge Tucker has made the following extract from it, in his Appendix to the 1st vol. pt. 2, of Blackstone :

“We are encouraged to look up to the throne, and implore your majesty’s paternal assistance in averting a calamity of a most alarming nature.

“The importation of slaves into the colonies from the coast of Africa *hath long been considered as a trade of great inhumanity, and under its present encouragement*, we have too much reason to fear, will endanger the very existence of your majesty’s American dominions.

“We are sensible that some of your majesty’s subjects of Great Britain may reap emoluments from this sort of traffic, but when we consider that it greatly retards the settlement of the colonies, with more *useful inhabitants*, and may in time have the most destructive influence, we presume to hope, that the *interest of a few* will be disregarded when placed in competition with the security and happiness of such numbers of your majesty’s dutiful and loyal subjects.

“Deeply impressed with these sentiments, we most humbly beseech your majesty to *remove all those restraints on your majesty’s governors of this colony*, which inhibit their assenting to such laws as might check so very pernicious a commerce.”

‘The petition proved unavailing. In the first clause of the independent constitution of Virginia, “the inhuman use of the

royal negative" in this matter is enumerated among the reasons of the separation from the mother country. Mr. Burke, as we have seen in one of the quotations which I have made from his speech on the conciliation with America, recognized her "refusal to deal any more in the inhuman traffic of the negro slaves, as one of the causes of her quarrel with Great Britain." I must claim permission to connect here with the petition, a statement subjoined to it, by Judge Tucker, which shows that it did not cost the British government a moment's deliberation to sacrifice "the security and happiness of such numbers of his majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects," to "the interest of the few" in England. I have lately been favoured with the perusal of a manuscript copy of a letter from Granville Sharp, Esq. of London, to a friend of the prime minister, dated March 25, 1794, in which he speaks of the petition thus: "I myself was desired, by a letter from America, to inquire for an answer to this *extraordinary* Virginia petition. I waited on the Secretary of State, and was informed by himself that the petition *was received*, but that (he apprehended) *no answer would be given.*" pp. 316, 317.

3. Twenty, nay, thirty years, before the abolition of the trade in slaves by England, it was abolished by law in many of the American states, and eighteen years before the English abolition, provision was made in the constitution of the United States for its abolition throughout America, which provision was carried into effect in 1808, the limit prescribed by the constitution. We place but little value on a slender priority of this kind. The only true comparison would be of shame, which nation forbore longest. But, in point of fact, England is neither the first nor the second nation, which interdicted this trade. For, besides what we have already asserted of the separate American states, and the provisions in the constitution of the United States, it was abolished by Denmark in 1792, by a law to take effect in 1803. 4. As far as the reproach of holding slaves goes, England is at this moment as deeply involved in it as America; her colonies being all stocked with them, the fruits of their labours regularly sent home to Old England, and their treatment no better, if as good, as in America.

All reproach, therefore, thrown upon us by Englishmen for the toleration of this evil, especially if connected with any complacency on the score of their own supposed comparative purity, is blind arrogance, which will not take counsel of common sense. It would give us heart-felt pleasure to be able

to stop here; to be able to say, that the evil of slavery was brought on us from a foreign quarter; has been continued among us from the necessity of the case, and the impossibility of being rid of it; and that we have seized every opportunity of arresting its progress, and preparing the way for its gradual extirpation. Till the present session of Congress, we could have said all this with truth. The important measures, which have passed that body, by a bare majority, a majority organized in a manner to throw the responsibility on several of the members personally, and not on their constituents, deprive us of some of the consolations, with which we have hitherto been accustomed to support this stain on our character. Up to this moment, the blame was not, could not fairly be thought ours. We did no more than tolerate the slavery where we found it, and in communities, whose circumstances seemed to render its exclusion impossible. An unanimous vote of the representatives of the slave-holding states, aided by a few votes from the free states, deprives us hereafter of our right to this alleviating reflection. When one looks over the list of the gentlemen who have been willing to take upon themselves to propagate slavery throughout the interior of America, and when one listens to the arguments, with which they justify the measure, it is impossible not to feel deference for many most respectable names on that list, or to deny that some of their arguments are plausible. These concessions, however, are surely no more than will be reciprocated by our southern brethren, who cannot refuse to do justice to the weight of character, as well as of argument, by which this restriction was maintained. If, then, these admissions balance each other, and considerations of policy, right, and constitutionality are allowed to be so equally weighed against each other, that an honest man may hold himself undecided on that score, then we say that the cause itself should have pleaded with a crying voice in its own favour, and that every American should have felt an impulse within him to resist the progress of slavery, which would have revolted at the very name of spreading it through the valley of the Missouri. Had the people of America felt this impulse, the main arguments against the restriction would have lost their force. From the territory herself, which prays to be admitted to the Union, there would have been no voice invoking the idea of the unimpaired sovereignty of a state. The South

would not have pleaded for the right of furnishing a slave-market with her surplus increase ; and none would have sifted the constitution, for the sake of proving the want of power to do that, which all had at heart to do. So that, without denying the justice of any one of the arguments adduced by the enemies of the restriction, we are still authorized to say, that had a due abhorrence of the institution prevailed at Congress, that humane measure would not have been defeated. To maintain that Missouri does claim, and has a right to claim, to hold slaves, and that an ascertained majority of Congress is disposed to sustain her in that claim, is precisely the reproach on our national character, which we would first have wiped off. If Congress could not forbid the progress of slavery, the greater the reproach ; and if the constitution itself has no check over its unlimited diffusion through the country, the deeper the shame, and the more disastrous the imperfection.

We have left ourselves no room to say any thing of the literary execution of Mr. Walsh's work. He is not a writer for the first time before the public, nor likely, therefore, to be much the wiser for our criticisms, did we make them. We think his style would gain force by greater simplicity in the structure of his sentences, and by abstaining from the use of learned and unusual words, such as *adumbrate*, *prophylactic*, and *paralogy*. For the rest, we have to tender him our thanks, not only for the gratification, but for the instruction he has afforded us. We shall never think the British much in earnest in deriding us, while they bestow the honours of knighthood on their naval captains for such inglorious victories as that of the Shannon over the Chesapeake ; nor be much afflicted, though they be in earnest, provided their calumnies produce us many more such volumes as this.